REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-16 and 25-38 remain in the application. Claims 1, 9, 25 and 32 are independent.

Rejections Summary

Claims 9, 11-14, 16 and 25-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,738,982 to Jerding (Jerding '982) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,792,616 to Jerding (Jerding '616). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Jerding '982 in view of Jerding '616 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,305,020 to Hoarty et al. (hereinafter "Hoarty"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Jerding '982 in view of Jerding '616 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,577 to Knudson et al. (hereinafter "Knudson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 15, 31, 32 and 34-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Jerding '982 in view of Jerding '616 and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20070033615 to Hassell et al. (hereinafter "Hassell"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Jerding '982 in view of Jerdig '616 and further in view of Hassell and further in view of Hoarty. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Jerding '982 in view of Jerding '616 and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No.

20050021609 to Houghton et al. (hereinafter "Houghton"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Jerding '982 in view of Jerding '616, further in view of Houghton and further in view of Hoarty. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Jerding '982 in view of Jerding '616, further in view of Houghton, and further in view of Hassell. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Claims

Independent claim 1 recites a method comprising:

- outputting an Electronic Programming Guide (EPG) for display by a client, wherein:
    - EPG data originates from a server;
    - the EPG includes a plurality of representations of a plurality of content;
    - at least one said content is television programming for receipt by the client over an Internet;
    - the client includes a plurality of applications;
    - one or more said content is provided for output by a respective said application; and
    - the EPG is configured to form one or more events in response to user interaction with one or more said representations, wherein the one or more events are based on information other than application identification information originating from the server; and
- executing a virtual tuner on the client to manage execution of each said plurality of applications to provide respective said content in response to the events formed utilizing the EPG, said virtual tuner utilizing an application identification table that includes a listing of one or more applications to enable execution of each of said plurality of applications.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office argues that the subject matter is obvious over Jerding '982 in view of Jerding '616. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, this claim has been amended to recite, that "EPG data originates from a server" and that "the EPG is configured to form one or more events in response to user interaction with one or more said representations, wherein the one or more events are based on information other than application identification information originating from the server."

Applicants understood the Office to agree that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the references of record. For example, Jerding '982 is directed to enabling a user to access functionality of a service infrastructure of an interactive television network, but fails to disclose or suggest an EPG in which "EPG data originates from a server" and "the EPG is configured to form one or more events ..., <u>wherein the one or more events are based on information other than application identification information originating from the server</u>," (emphasis added) as presently recited in independent claim 1. Jerding '616 was cited to clarify the operation of the System Application Manager (SAM) and for its alleged teaching of the process of executing applications, but fails to remedy the deficiencies in Jerding '982 noted above.

As discussed during the interview, claim 1 stands allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 1 apply equally to these claims. Claims 2-8 are also allowable by virtue of the additional features they recite.

Independent claim 9 recites in a virtual tuner executed on a client, a method comprising:

- receiving a selection made from a plurality of content using an EPG that is output by the client, wherein:
- the EPG includes a representation of each said content;

- each said content is provided for output by a respective one or more of a plurality of applications; and
- at least one said content is television programming;
- choosing one or more of the plurality of applications that, when executed, provide the selected content, wherein the choosing is independent of any application identifying information originating from a computer distinct from the client; and
- managing execution of the chosen one or more applications to output the selected content.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office argues that the subject matter is obvious over Jerding '982 in view of Jerding '616. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, this claim has been amended to recite, "choosing one or more of the plurality of applications that, when executed, provide the selected content, wherein the choosing is independent of any application identifying information originating from a computer distinct from the client" (emphasis added).

Applicants understood the Office to agree that claim 9, as amended, is allowable over the references of record. For example, Jerding '982 is directed to enabling a user to access functionality of a service infrastructure of an interactive television network, but fails to disclose or suggest an EPG choosing an application to display content "wherein the choosing is independent of any application identifying information originating from a computer distinct from the client" as presently recited in independent claim 9. Jerding '616 was cited to clarify the operation of the System Application Manager (SAM) and for its alleged teaching of the process of executing applications, but fails to remedy the deficiencies in Jerding '982 noted above.

As discussed during the interview, claim 9 stands allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 10-16 depend from claim 9 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 9 apply equally to these claims. Claims 10-16 are also allowable by virtue of the additional features they recite.

Independent claim 25 recites a client comprising:

- a processor;
- a network interface, communicatively coupled to the processor, configured to provide a network connection to a wide area network (WAN);
- a output interface, communicatively coupled to the processor, configured to provide an output for rendering by a display device; and
- memory configured to maintain:
- a plurality of applications that are executable on the processor to provide an output of content on the output interface, wherein at least one said content is television programming received at the network interface;
- an EPG engine that is executable on the processor to provide an EPG for output on the output interface, wherein the EPG includes a plurality of representations of said content for selection; and
- a virtual tuner that is executable on the processor to launch one or more of said plurality of applications in response to selection of said content using the EPG, independent of any application identifying information originating from a computer distinct from the client, said virtual tuner utilizing an application identification table that includes a listing of one or more applications to enable execution of each of said plurality of applications.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office argues that the subject matter is obvious over Jerding '982 in view of Jerding '616. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, this claim has been amended to recite, "a virtual tuner that is executable on the processor to launch one or more of said plurality of applications in response to selection of said content using the EPG, <u>independent of any application identifying information originating from a computer distinct from the client</u>, said virtual tuner utilizing an application identification table that includes a listing of one or more applications to enable execution of each of said plurality of applications" (emphasis added).

Applicants understood the Office to agree that claim 25, as amended, is allowable over the references of record. For example, Jerding '982 is directed to enabling a user to access functionality of a service infrastructure of an interactive television network, but fails to disclose or suggest an EPG that launches applications "independent of any application identifying information originating from a computer distinct from the client" as presently recited in independent claim 25. Jerding '616 was cited to clarify the operation of the System Application Manager (SAM) and for its alleged teaching of the process of executing applications, but fails to remedy the deficiencies in Jerding '982 noted above..

As discussed during the interview, claim 25 stands allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 26-31 depend from claim 25 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 25 apply equally to these claims. Claims 26-31 are also allowable by virtue of the additional features they recite.

.

Independent claim 32 recites a system comprising:

- a network;
- an EPG provider communicatively coupled to the network and including remote EPG data that describes remote content that is available over the network, the remote content including television programming;
- a client communicatively coupled to the network and including;
- one or more processors and a plurality of applications that are executable thereon to provide at least one of local content and the remote content for rendering on a display device; and
- local EPG data that describes the local content;
- a guide application that is executable to generate an EPG from the remote and local EPG content that is configured to initiate one or more events; and
- a virtual tuner that is executable to manage the plurality of applications in response to the one or more events, said virtual tuner utilizing an application identification table that includes a listing of one or more

applications to enable execution of each of the plurality of applications independent of any application identifying information originating from a computer distinct from the client.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office argues that the subject matter is obvious over Jerding '982 in view of Jerding '616 and further in view of Hassell. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, this claim has been amended to recite, "a virtual tuner that is executable to manage the plurality of applications in response to the one or more events, said virtual tuner utilizing an application identification table that includes a listing of one or more applications to enable execution of each of the plurality of applications <u>independent of any application identifying information originating from a computer distinct from the client.</u>" (emphasis added).

Applicants understood the Office to agree that claim 32, as amended, is allowable over the references of record. For example, Jerding '982 is directed to enabling a user to access functionality of a service infrastructure of an interactive television network, but fails to disclose or suggest an EPG that launches applications "independent of any application identifying information originating from a computer distinct from the client" as presently recited in independent claim 32. Jerding '616 was cited to clarify the operation of the System Application Manager (SAM) and for its alleged teaching of the process of executing applications, but fails to remedy the deficiencies in Jerding '982 noted above..

As discussed during the interview, claim 32 stands allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 33-38 depend from claim 32 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 32 apply equally to these claims. Claims 33-38 are also allowable by virtue of the additional features they recite.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _____   By: _____
                                     David W. Foster
                                     Reg. No. 60,902
                                     (509) 324-9256 ext 219